



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/388,723 02/15/93 ALBERT

H 960062.401

EXAMINER

B2M1/0127

SEED AND BERRY
6300 COLUMBIA CENTER
SEATTLE WA 98104-7092

ART UNIT 2211 PAPER NUMBER 7

2211

DATE MAILED: 01/27/97

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☐ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 11/16/96 ☒ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 13-49, 60 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☒ Claims 1-12, 50-59 have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 13-49, 60 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. ; filed on
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.O. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

EXAMINER'S RESPONSE

Status of Application.

1. In response to the applicant's amendment received on 11/25/96. The examiner has considered the new presentation of claims and applicant arguments in view of the disclosure and the present state of the prior art. And it is the examiner's position that claims 13-49,60 are unpatentable for the reasons set forth in this office action:

ART REJECTION

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 13-15,20,28-30,43-45,48,49,60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Rogge and Dieleman. Rogge shows a financial transaction system with a transaction device which communicates to authorization processor by sending financial transaction signals and receiving authorization/denial signals from the authorization signals. Rogge shows the communication channel to be a PSTN line with modems.

In an analogous art, Dieleman shows a financial system. Dieleman shows the equivalence of a wireless communication media and a conductor or a fiber for communication system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have utilized a wireless transmission

system to convey the signals in the Rogge system since a wireless transmission system is a known equivalent which the artisan would recognize does not need expensive wires.

The examiner takes official notice that wireless adapters between PSTN and wireless media exist all the time, for example mobile telephone systems. To have used a wireless adapter between the PSTN and the wireless systems in the above modified system would have been verily obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention.

Regarding the first, second and third communication means, the host computer, these elements read on a repeater or gateway. Both of which are common in the art of communication networks, and are advantageous in making systems cooperative with each other. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have utilized first, second, third communication means and host computers (for gateways) to interconnect various information networks together and convey information to each other.

4. Claims 16-27,31-42,46,47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Rogge and Dieleman as applied to claims 13,28,43 above, and further in view of common knowledge in the art. The examiner takes official notice that the devices claimed (claims 16,17,31,32,46,47) are well known devices equivalent to the devices taught by Rogge. The examiner takes official notice that the networks

claimed (claims 19-27,34-42) are well know networks equivalent to the networks taught by Rogge. Furthermore, the extent of disclosure the applicant provides is evidence of the fact that the applicant believes that the types of network (or types of device) are known to the artisan. The applicant has not invented these specific networks (or devices). Regarding claims 18,33, the references, discussed above, discloses the claimed invention except for having the claimed elements in a single computer system. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place all these elements in a single computer, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (1893). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have utilized any of the claimed networks (or devices) in the above modified system since that would have been equivalents to the elements used in the above modified system.

REMARKS

Response to Arguments.

The following discussion is introduced in direct response to the arguments presented in the instant amendment:

The examiner takes official notice that wireless adapters between PSTN and wireless media exist all the time, for example mobile telephone systems. To have

used a wireless adapter between the PSTN and the wireless systems in the above modified system would have been verily obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly,

5 **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

10 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT
15 MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

08/388729
2211


6

CONTACT INFORMATION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Zimmerman whose telephone number is (703) 305-4796.

- 5 Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4900.

**Brian Zimmerman
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2211**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'B. Zimmerman', written over the printed name and title.

10 **baz
703-305-4796**